Nonlocality as the dynamical origin of the non-markovian process in quantum isolated system

Hai-Jun Wang*
Center for Theoretical Physics and School of Physics, Jilin University,Changchun 130023, China

In the previous paper, it has been proved that elastic scattering processes of two quantum particles are always accompanied with nonlocal processes. Furthermore, it is found that setting an additional Hamiltonian after the originally scattering one can help to describe the two type of processes in a united frame. Here we discuss the contribution of this additional Hamiltonian to irreversible process in isolated quantum systems. The use of the Hamiltonian can induce the non-Markovian Langevin equation, showing a complex memory effect, and thus revealing the irreversible essence of isolated system without appealing to reservoir or approximate methods (e.g. coarse grain) as usually done.

*E-mail address: whj@mail.jlu.edu.cn

arXiv:quant-ph/0512182v1 21 Dec 2005

The Second Law of Thermodynamics is one of fundamental laws of physics. However, its origin remains puzzling [1]. On the macroscopic level the well known equation $dS/dt \geq 0$ is always encountered, i.e., the processes of an isolated system are always irreversible, whereas on the microscopic level, the fundamental dynamical equations are all of notorious reversibility. The puzzle arises from the difficulty of reconciling these two conflicting sides. Inspired by the faith in macroscopic irreversibility, many efforts have been made to explain the second law from more fundamental points of view, such as considering fluctuation or chaos, assumption of ergodicity from Gibbs, method of Coarse grain from von Neumann, proposing a bath environment, the H-theorem from Boltzmann, star-Unitary transformation and projective operator from Prigogine, etc. Any one of the above assumptions can derive the macroscopic properties formally. However, in contrast to the requirement of an irreversible theory derived from underlying microscopic laws, rather they are alternative versions of macroscopic phenomenon. From microscopic viewpoints, some other schemes, such as the quantum measurement from Laudau and Lifshitz [2], decoherence from Zurek [3,4] etc. are suggested, but these assertions do not pertain to an isolated system.

To maximize the entropy is equal to approach the equivalence, say, time arrow. The mention of time reminds us of the theory of relativity, in which only the time interval is emphasized, but the time arrow has not been considered. Nevertheless, by a deliberate examination one can find that in fact, in general relativity, the dynamical equations are not reversible with respect to time [5]. This feature brings us the hope that it is possible to find the irreversible aspects of dynamical equations at a microscopic level. If so, the irreversibility will automatically appear in stochastic differential equation (e.g. Fokker-Plank equation or Langevin equation) or evolution/transport equation (e.g. Bolzmann equation). In this paper, we make attempt to derive an irreversible Langevin equation from fundamental viewpoint of quantum mechanics by applying its nonlocal effect.

The model used here is simple: N fermions in an isolated box, are supposed to be wave packages (Matter Wave) with the same initial width. After a long time, during which many scattering processes have happened, all the particles are expected to own a limit width of wave package in contrast to a pure quantum wave package (without affection of any scattering) that its width will diffuse to infinite. Through this mechanism, the wave packages are localized and thus considered as macroscopic particles. After all, the scattering processes with nonlocal effect may put or destroy correlations between partial waves of the wave packages, thus destroy the regular evolution of a pure wave package. And probably for this same factor, the evolution equation of resultant particles is irreversible. It is interesting to note that the localization of quantum wave is realized through nonlocal interaction, and at the same time, the reversible microscopic dynamics for quantum waves generates irreversible macroscopic evolving equation for particles.

In the previous paper [6], starting from the AB-like nonlocal effect, we have derived an additional Hamiltonian, which was demanded to contribute only to nonlocality (geometrical phase shift). It can be assumed that the additional Hamiltonian is too small to induce any transitions between energy levels, as required by Berry phase[7] in adiabatic approximation. Now we will attempt to examine this Hamiltonian by applying it to derive the Langevin equation in order to confirm that it can induce memory effect. In recent years, the generalized Langevin equation(GLE), i.e. equation with memory effect, has been widely used to study non-Markovian processes in many types of open systems[8-11]; nevertheless few of them has concerned the isolated system (microcanonical ensemble) for the well known difficulty of dynamical origin.

Let the additional part of Hamiltonian be denoted by $\mathcal{H}_N$, and the total is

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_N \tag{1}$$

furthermore we know that the part $\mathcal{H}_N$ has the same form as $\mathcal{H}_0$, only with some coefficients before corresponding terms. The coefficients are decided by the nonlocal region. Since $\mathcal{H}_0$ only contributes to transition, and only the contribution of $\mathcal{H}_N$ is meaningful for our analysis, so we just consider the part $\mathcal{H}_N$. Additionally, we omit the

coefficients before all of the terms of $\mathcal{H}_N$ for convenience even though they may vary from term to term, the neglecting of them will not affect our resultant analysis. In these respects, the $\mathcal{H}_N$ may thoroughly possess the same form as that of $\mathcal{H}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_N &= \frac{1}{2m}(\vec{P} - e\vec{A})^2 + e\phi \\ &= \frac{\vec{P}^2}{2m} - \frac{e}{2m}(\vec{P}\cdot\vec{A} + \vec{A}\cdot\vec{P}) + \vec{A}\cdot\vec{A} + e\phi \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The Hamiltonian pertains to the system that includes many particles with both spin and charges, as mentioned in Ref.[12]. In such system the AB like nonlocal effect always happens, in the plane where corresponding scattering process happens, but planes are different between scattering processes, not as required by two dimension systems. Considering the suggestion of Ref. [12], the nonlocal effect will happen between one particle moment and another particle's charge. However, in the general experiments on testing the AB effect or theoretical works proposed by authors, the magnetic flux was always assumed not to be leaking out of a certain cylinder-like region, while in a realistic model that the flux is generated by a particle's spin $\vec{\mu} = \frac{e}{m}\vec{S}$, the required condition is by no means preserved, the surrounded flux is not determinable. Phenomenally, this stochastic aspect and the scalar potential are included in the stochastic force $F(t,r)$, the properties of which are given only in average.

$$\mathcal{H}_N = \frac{\vec{P}^2}{2m} - \frac{e}{2m}(\vec{P}\cdot\vec{A} + \vec{A}\cdot\vec{P}) + F(t,r) \tag{3}$$

where $\langle F(t,r)\rangle = 0$ and $\langle F(t_1,r)F(t_2,r)\rangle$ is known. Applying commutation relations and the Coulomb gauge $\vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{A} = 0$, the second term of the equation can be changed to

$$-\frac{e}{2m}(\vec{P}\cdot\vec{A} + \vec{A}\cdot\vec{P}) = -\frac{e}{m}\vec{A}\cdot\vec{P} \tag{4}$$

To express more clearly, hereafter we use bold letter to express the vectors to be as arguments, e.g.$\vec{k} \to \mathbf{k}$ etc. Now let us expand the vector potential as done in quantization process [13],

$$\vec{A}(\mathbf{x},t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}}\sum_{r}(\frac{\hbar c^2}{2V\omega_{\mathbf{k}}})^{\frac{1}{2}}\vec{\varepsilon}_r(\mathbf{k})[a_r(\mathbf{k})e^{i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}-\omega t)} + a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})e^{-i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}-\omega t)}] \tag{5}$$

and when $t = 0$, the corresponding vector potential is

$$\vec{A}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}}\sum_{r}(\frac{\hbar c^2}{2V\omega_{\mathbf{k}}})^{\frac{1}{2}}\vec{\varepsilon}_r(\mathbf{k})[a_r(\mathbf{k})e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} + a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}]\ . \tag{6}$$

Substitute the above expansion into eq. (5),

$$-\frac{e}{m}\vec{A}\cdot\mathbf{p} = -\frac{e}{m}\sum_{\mathbf{k}}\sum_{r}(\frac{\hbar c^2}{2V\omega_{\mathbf{k}}})^{\frac{1}{2}}\vec{\varepsilon}_r(\mathbf{k})\cdot\mathbf{p}[a_r(\mathbf{k})e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} + a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}]. \tag{7}$$

Now starting from the above equation, let us discuss the dipole approximation and quadrupole approximation respectively. Although the terminology is quite similar to the calculation in the transition amplitude, but as mentioned above, the nonlocal Hamiltonian will not induce any transition. We only use the approximation as a tool, bearing in mind that the Hamiltonian used here is only the part of nonlocality.

(i) Dipole approximation While $\lambda \gg \mid \vec{x} \mid$, $\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x} \ll 1$, $e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \sim e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \sim 1$, then the equation (8) yeilds

$$-\frac{e}{m}\vec{A}\cdot\mathbf{p} = \sum_{\mathbf{k},r}V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p})[a_r(\mathbf{k}) + a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})] \tag{8}$$

where $V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p}) = -\frac{e}{m}(\frac{\hbar c^2}{2V\omega_{\mathbf{k}}})^{\frac{1}{2}}\vec{\varepsilon}_r(\mathbf{k})\cdot\mathbf{p}$. And the Hamiltonian in eq.(4) now reads

$$\mathcal{H}_N = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m} + F(t,r) + \sum_{\mathbf{k}}\hbar\omega_{\mathbf{k}}a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})a_r(\mathbf{k}) + \sum_{\mathbf{k},r}V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p})[a_r(\mathbf{k}) + a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})]. \tag{9}$$

the additional terms of $\hbar\omega_{\mathbf{k}}a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})a_r(\mathbf{k})$ have derived from the pure energy of the electromagnitic energy $\vec{E}^2+\vec{B}^2$. In following let us evaluate the evolving equation for coordinates, momentum, $a_r(\mathbf{k})$ and $a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})$ respectively:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{i}{\hbar}[\mathcal{H}_N, \mathbf{x}] = \frac{\mathbf{p}}{m} + \sum_{\mathbf{k},r} \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} V_{\vec{k},r}(\mathbf{p})[a_r(\mathbf{k}) + a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})] \tag{10}$$

where we have used the commutation $[f(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{x}] = -i\hbar\vec{\nabla}_{\mathbf{p}} f(\mathbf{p})$. For momentum,

$$\dot{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{i}{\hbar}[\mathcal{H}_N, \mathbf{x}] = 0 \tag{11}$$

and

$$\dot{a}_r^\dagger = \frac{i}{\hbar}[\mathcal{H}_N, a_r^\dagger] = i\omega_{\mathbf{k}} a_r^\dagger + \frac{i}{\hbar} V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p}) \tag{12a}$$

$$\dot{a}_r = \frac{i}{\hbar}[\mathcal{H}_N, a_r^\dagger] = -i\omega_{\mathbf{k}} a_r - \frac{i}{\hbar} V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p}) \tag{12b}$$

The equation (13a) and (13b) can be directly resolved by applying Laplace transformation. Since the two equations are Hermite to each other, only one of them is necessarily considered. The result for $a_r^\dagger(t)$ reads

$$a_r^\dagger(t) = a_r^\dagger(0)e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t} + \frac{i}{\hbar}\int_0^t e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}\tau} V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p}(t-\tau))d\tau \tag{13}$$

As $V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p}(t-\tau))$ is independent of time t, the integration can be carried out,

$$\begin{aligned} a_r^\dagger(t) &= a_r^\dagger(0)e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t} + \frac{i}{\hbar} V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p}) \int_0^t e^{-i\omega_{\vec{k}}\tau} d\tau \\ &= a_r^\dagger(0)e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t} + \frac{V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p})}{\hbar\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}[1 - e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t}] \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Applying the result to equation (11), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}} &= \frac{\mathbf{p}}{m} + \sum_{\mathbf{k},r} \vec{\nabla}_{\mathbf{p}} V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p})[a_r(\mathbf{k}) + a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})] \\ &= \frac{\mathbf{p}}{m} + \sum_{\mathbf{k},r} V_0(\mathbf{p})[a_r(\mathbf{k}) + a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})]\vec{\varepsilon}_r(\mathbf{k}) \cdot (\vec{\nabla}_{\mathbf{p}}\mathbf{p}) \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $V_0(\mathbf{p}) = (-\frac{e}{m})(\frac{\hbar c^2}{2V\omega_{\mathbf{k}}})^{\frac{1}{2}}$. It can be noticed that in this case there appears no memory effect, so the dipole process from nonlocality has nothing to do with the non-Markovian process. Then let us turn to quadrupole process.

(ii) *Quadrupole approximation:* $e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} \sim 1 + i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}$, $e^{-i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} \sim 1 - i\mathbf{k}\cdot\vec{x}$. If omitting the interaction terms that appeared in dipole approximation, the qualitative results will not be affected. By doing so and employing the same procedure as the above equations, the equation (7) yields

$$-\frac{e}{m}\vec{A}\cdot\mathbf{p} = \sum_{\mathbf{k},r} V_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{x})[a_r(\mathbf{k}) - a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})] \tag{16}$$

where $V_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{p},\vec{x}) = i(-\frac{e}{m})(\frac{\hbar c^2}{2V\omega_{\mathbf{k}}})^{\frac{1}{2}}\vec{\varepsilon}_r(\mathbf{k})\cdot\mathbf{p}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}$. And the nonlocal Hamiltonian turns to

$$\mathcal{H}_N = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m} + F(t,r) + \sum_{\mathbf{k},r}\hbar\omega_{\mathbf{k}}a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})a_r(\mathbf{k}) + \sum_{\mathbf{k},r} V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{x})[a_r(\mathbf{k}) - a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})] \tag{17}$$

Again, calculating the time derivatives of coordinate and momentum, $a_r(\mathbf{k})$ and $a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})$:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{i}{\hbar}[\mathcal{H}_N, \mathbf{x}] = \frac{\mathbf{p}}{m} + \sum_{\mathbf{k},r} \vec{\nabla}_{\mathbf{p}} V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{x})[a_r(\mathbf{k}) - a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})] \tag{18}$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{P}} = \frac{i}{\hbar}[\mathcal{H}_N, \mathbf{p}] = -\sum_{\mathbf{k},r} \vec{\bigtriangledown}_{\mathbf{x}} V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{x})[a_r(\mathbf{k}) - a_r^\dagger(\mathbf{k})] \tag{19}$$

where we have used the commutator $[\mathbf{p}, f(\mathbf{x})] = -i\hbar\vec{\bigtriangledown}_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x})$, and

$$\dot{a}_r^\dagger = \frac{i}{\hbar}[\mathcal{H}_N, a_r^\dagger] = i\omega_{\mathbf{k}} a_r^\dagger + \frac{i}{\hbar} V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p}) \tag{20a}$$

$$\dot{a}_r = \frac{i}{\hbar}[\mathcal{H}_N, a_r^\dagger] = -i\omega_{\mathbf{k}} a_r + \frac{i}{\hbar} V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p}) \tag{20b}$$

the eqs.(20) can be resolved by using the Laplace transformation like eqs. (13). Since the above two equations are not Hermite to each other, the solutions should be written out separately

$$a_r^\dagger(t) = a_r^\dagger(0)e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t} + \frac{i}{\hbar}\int_0^t e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}\tau} V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p}(t-\tau), \mathbf{x}(t-\tau))d\tau \tag{21}$$

$$a_r(t) = a_r(0)e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t} + \frac{i}{\hbar}\int_0^t e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}\tau} V_{\mathbf{k},r}(\mathbf{p}(t-\tau), \mathbf{x}(t-\tau))d\tau \tag{22}$$

However, the integrals can't be carried out, because $V_{\mathbf{k},r}$ is of intricate time-dependence due to that the momentum in it is determined by eq.(19), which is not trivial now. Substitute the above solution to eq.(18) and eq.(19), one obtains

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{\mathbf{p}}{m} - \frac{2i}{\hbar}\sum_{\mathbf{k},r} V_{\mathbf{0}}(\mathbf{k})\vec{\varepsilon}_r(\mathbf{k})\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}\int_0^t \sin\omega\tau V_{\mathbf{k},r}(t-\tau)d\tau + \tilde{F}_q(t) \tag{23}$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{2i}{\hbar}\sum_{\mathbf{k},r} V_0(\mathbf{k})\vec{\varepsilon}_r(\mathbf{k})\cdot\mathbf{p}\,\mathbf{k}\int_0^t \sin\omega\tau V_{\mathbf{k},r}(t-\tau)d\tau + \tilde{F}_p(t) \tag{24}$$

where the random forces are

$$\tilde{F}_q(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k},r} iV_{\mathbf{0}}(\mathbf{k})\vec{\varepsilon}_r(\mathbf{k})\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}[a_r(0)e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t} - a_r^\dagger(0)e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t}] \tag{25}$$

$$\tilde{F}_p(t) = -\sum_{\mathbf{k},r} iV_{\mathbf{0}}(\mathbf{k})\vec{\varepsilon}_r(\mathbf{k})\cdot\mathbf{p}\,\mathbf{k}[a_r(0)e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t} - a_r^\dagger(0)e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t}] \tag{26}$$

This type of random forces is determined by the initial condition. The original force seems vanished but in fact it has affection on the $a_r(0)$ and $a_r^\dagger(0)$ as an initial stochastic input. The present stochastic force decided directly by initial condition and thus are relevant to the original stochastic force $F(r,t)$. Anyway, the time-dependence of eq.(23) and eq.(24) is obvious and unavoidable.

It is difficult to resolve the equations (23) and (24) as they are of intricate manner of self-dependence and nonlinearity. As for the eq.(24), it is still not easy to treat the integral even with the approximation of making the outside part of the integral sign as a constant vector, because the Laplace transformation can't be performed on the integrand $V_{\mathbf{k},r}(t-\tau)$ that includes all the components of $\mathbf{p}(t-\tau)$ as $\vec{\varepsilon}_r(\mathbf{k})\cdot\mathbf{p}(t-\tau)\,\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}(t-\tau)$. So it is impossible to treat the equation as general Langevin equation: $m\dot{\upsilon}(t) = -U'(x) - \int_0^t \beta(t-t')\upsilon(t')dt' + \varepsilon(t)$ [8], to which the method of Laplace transformation can be applied. So the solution of these equations deserve further research.

Conclusion and Discussion Conventionally we hold that if the number of photons is stable: $\langle\sum_{i=1}\hbar\omega_{\vec{k}}a^\dagger a\rangle = constant$, then the systems possess the equilibrium properties. But essential aspect of recognizing the stochastic in a quantum system should not be confined to the knowledge of energy levels. It is emphasized here that the random phase of the wave function should also be considered properly. And being included in the dynamical equation, the changes of phase may be helpful in treating the reversible puzzle of fundamental dynamical equations. We notice from the eq.(23) and eq.(24) that random phases are not of a purely stochastic character, with its variation constrained by the dynamical equation as follows. If assuming that the particle starts at time $t = 0$ and at $x = x_0$ with the velocity $\upsilon = \upsilon_0$, the mean square value of its displacement at time t is given by [14],

$$\langle (x(t)-x_0)^2\rangle = \int_0^t \int_0^t \langle \upsilon(t_1)\upsilon(t_2)\rangle dt_1 dt_2 \tag{27}$$

where $\upsilon(t)$ is $\dot{\mathbf{x}}$ in eq.(23) and the $\mathbf{p}$ in it is resolved from eq.(24). The equation (27) adds a strong constraint to any wave package's evolution, for example, to Gauss wave package. The equation will modify the evolution of Gauss wave package out of regular way and thus damage the diffusion mechanism and coherence state of constituent plane waves[3, 4, 15]. In this sense, the memory effect just exhibits its effects by damaging the regular evolution of quantum wave, which is originally a reversible evolution.

The reversible evolution without nonlocality can actually be seen from the Feynman path integral method for a quantum wave: the form $\psi(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) = \int K(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2; \mathbf{x}_1, t_1)\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1)d^3\mathbf{x}_1$ is obviously Markovian, because all information of any moment can induce the wave of any other moment. The Schrödinger equation possesses the same essence, as we know, it is of the same virtue as the Feynman method in describing quantum mechanics. We conclude here that these reversible form can be broken if the nonlocal effect is introduced.

The motivation of this paper arose from the relationship of two unknown: the gauge field born from unknown, and where the unknown exists is just the place we use statistics and stochastic.

In conclusion, this paper only resolves the problem how the quantum process is irreversible due to the quantum nonlocal effect. However, whether the system will evolve into equilibrium is not known for the absence of the exact solutions to equations (23) and (24). Therefore to understand how the system approaches the equilibrium, the study on the solution of the equations is of importance. It may evolve into equilibrium under some situation, and may not for other cases. Peculiarly, some initial conditions may also be critical for the solution, e.g. the stochastic force origin, the nonequilibrium distribution of particles, etc.

I. REFERENCES

[1] J. Gemmer, A. Otte, and G. Mahler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 1927 (2001);
[2] L. Landau and M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Mechanics* (Pergamon Press, Oxford,1978); *Quantum Mechanics* (Pergamon Press, Oxford,1977).
[3] W. Zurek, Phys. Today 44, No. 10, 36 (1991); 46, No. 12, 81 (1993).
[4] W. Zurek and J. Paz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 2508 (1994)
[5] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972: Eq.(9.2.1) in pp.220.
[6] preprint arXiv: quant-ph/0512162.
[7] M.V.Berry, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **392**,45-57(1984);
[8] J. D. Bao and Y. Z. Zhuo, Phys. Rev. E 71, 010102(R) (2005) ;
[9] Z. Kanokov, Y. V. Palchikov, G. G. Adamian, N. V. Antonenko, and W. Scheid, Phys. Rev. E 71, 016121 (2005) ; *ibid*, 71, 016122 (2005);
[10] T. Yu, Phys. Rev. A 69, 062107 (2004) ;
[11] J. Lee *et al*, Phys. Rev. A 70, 024301 (2004);
[12] F. Wilczek and Y. S. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 13(1990);
[13] F. Mandl, G. Shaw, *Quantum Field Theory* (Jhon Wiley and Sons Ltd., 1984): first chapter.
[14] H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck Equation* for *method of solution and applications*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1984
[15] L. Zheng, C. Li, Y. Li, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A 71, 062101 (2005);